

CONFERENCE OF THE EIGHTEEN-NATION COMMITTEE  
ON DISARMAMENT

ENDC/PV.239  
10 February 1966  
ENGLISH

---

FINAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO HUNDRED AND THIRTY-NINTH MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,  
on Thursday, 10 February 1966, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman:

Mr. A. CORREA do LAGO

(Brazil)

OF MICHIGAN

MAR 29 1966

DOCUMENT  
COLLECTION

## PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Brazil:

Mr. A. CORREA do LAGO  
Mr. G. de CARVALHO SILOS  
Mr. C. H. PAULINO PRATES

Bulgaria:

Mr. C. LUKANOV  
Mr. Y. GOLEMANOV  
Mr. B. KONSTANTINOV  
Mr. D. KOSTOV

Burma:

U MAUNG MAUNG GYI

Canada:

Mr. E. L. M. BURNS  
Mr. S. F. RAE  
Mr. C. J. MARSHALL  
Mr. P. D. LEE

Czechoslovakia:

Mr. Z. CERNIK  
Mr. V. VAINAR  
Mr. R. KLEIN

Ethiopia:

Mr. A. ABERRA  
Mr. A. ZELLEKE  
Mr. B. ASSFAW

India

Mr. V. C. TRIVEDI  
Mr. K. P. LUKOSE  
Mr. K. P. JAIN

Italy:

Mr. F. CAVALLETTI  
Mr. G. P. TOZZOLI  
Mr. S. AVETTA  
Mr. F. SORO

Mexico:

Mr. A. GOMEZ ROBLEDO  
Mr. M. TELLO MACIAS

Nigeria:

Mr. G. O. IJEWERE  
Mr. O. O. ADESOLA

PRESENT AT THE TABLE (cont'd)

<u>Poland:</u>	Mr. M. BLUSZTAJN
	Mr. E. STANIEWSKI
	Mr. A. SKOWRONSKI
	Mrs. H. SKOWRONSKA
<u>Romania:</u>	Mr. V. DUMITRESCU
	Mr. N. ECOBESCU
	Mr. C. UNGUREANU
	Mr. A. CORCIANU
<u>Sweden:</u>	Mr. W. WACHTMEISTER
	Mr. H. BLIX
	Mr. P. HAMMARSKJOLD
	Mr. R. BOMAN
<u>Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:</u>	Mr. S. K. TSARAPKIN
	Mr. O. A. GRINEVSKY
	Mr. I. M. PALENYKH
	Mr. G. K. EFIMOV
<u>United Arab Republic:</u>	Mr. H. KHALLAF
	Mr. A. OSIEN
	Mr. M. KASSEM
	Mr. A. A. SALAM
<u>United Kingdom:</u>	Lord CHALFONT
	Sir H. BEELEY
	Mr. J. G. TAHOURDIN
	Miss E. J. M. RICHARDSON
<u>United States of America:</u>	Mr. W. C. FOSTER
	Mr. C. H. TIMBERLAKE
	Mr. D. S. MACDONALD
	Mr. G. BUNN
<u>Special Representative of the Secretary-General:</u>	Mr. F. P. SPINELLI
<u>Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General:</u>	Mr. W. EPSTEIN

The CHAIRMAN (Brazil): I declare open the two hundred and thirty-ninth plenary meeting of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament.

As this is the first time I am addressing the Committee, I should like, as representative of Brazil, to associate my delegation with others which have already expressed condolences to the Indian and Nigerian delegations on the recent tragic and untimely deaths of Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri, Prime Minister Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa and Dr. Homi Bhabha.

I wish also to add the voice of the Brazilian delegation to those of other delegations which have extended a welcome to the new representatives of Ethiopia, Mr. Aberra; Nigeria, Mr. Ijewere; the United Arab Republic, Mr. Khallaf; and Sweden, Count Wachtmeister. It is also, of course, a pleasure to welcome back to our midst the representative of Poland, Mr. Blusztajn.

Mr. DUMITRESCU (Romania) (translation from French) The work of our Committee resumed two weeks ago. Before dealing with the substance of my speech, I should like to associate the Romanian delegation with all the other delegations that have expressed their sincere condolences to the Indian delegation on the untimely death of Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri, an eminent statesman who placed his talent and energy at the service of the cause of peace and understanding among the peoples.

I should also like to express our condolences to the Nigerian delegation on the death of Prime Minister Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa.

I also wish to express our condolences to the Indian delegation on the heavy loss sustained through the tragic death of the illustrious Indian scientist, Dr. Homi Bhabha.

Allow me also to address the greetings of the Romanian delegation to all the previous participants in the disarmament debates -- to Mr. Blusztajn, head of the Polish delegation, who is once again amongst us, and to our new colleagues: Mr. Khallaf, head of the delegation of the United Arab Republic, Mr. Aberra, head of the Ethiopian delegation, Mr. Ijewere, permanent representative of Nigeria at the Conference, and Mr. Wachtmeister, representative of Sweden. To all of them we wish every success in their activities, and we are convinced that we shall co-operate with them fruitfully.

At the same time I should like to welcome the Special Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Spinelli, and the Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Epstein, who assist us so competently.

(Mr. Dunitrescu, Romania)

On behalf of the Romanian Delegation, I wholeheartedly congratulate the Soviet delegation on the remarkable achievement of the Soviet Union, whose automatic station Luna-9 has succeeded in making a soft landing on the moon, as well as on the achievement, for the first time in history, of contact with another celestial body. This is a new and brilliant feat of science and technology which marks a further victory by man in the conquest of outer space. We wish the Soviet scientists, technicians and workers, as well as the Soviet people as a whole, further success in the development of science and technology placed at the Service of peace and the progress of humanity.

Within the scope of this general debate, the Romanian delegation would like to reaffirm the viewpoint of the Romanian Socialist Republic on certain problems included in the agenda of the present session of the Committee.

As previous speakers have mentioned, the new stage in the disarmament negotiations has begun under auspices unlikely to facilitate the achievement of progress towards the accomplishment of the tasks assigned to us. We refer in the first place to the continuation and intensification of the armed aggression of the United States of America against the Viet-Namense people, which has created a great danger to peace and security in South-East Asia and the whole world. It is now nearly two years since Viet-Nam has become a place where the hopes of a people for freedom and independence are confronted in the harshest manner with a policy of force and brutal interference. Quite recently this aggression has been intensified by the resumption of attacks by United States military aircraft against the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam: bombardments are being carried out against populated centres, towns, villages and economic objectives, causing civilian casualties and material damage.

The Romanian delegation wishes to express on this occasion the steadfast position of the Romanian Socialist Republic in regard to the aggression against the Viet-Namense people. This position was recently reaffirmed by the Romanian Government in the reply of the President of the Council of State, Chivu Stoica, to the letter from the President of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam, Ho Chi Minh; and in the statement of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Romania concerning the resumption of air attacks by the United States of America against the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam. The Romanian people and Government, deeply attached to the principle that all peoples have the sacred and inalienable right to decide their own destiny freely without any foreign interference, make common cause with the heroic struggle of the Viet-Namense people in defence of the independence and freedom of their fatherland.

(Mr. Dunitrescu, Romania)

The resumption of air attacks against the territory of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam proves that the so-called "peace offensive" initiated in Washington is meant only to mislead public opinion; it is a screen behind which the United States of America has increased the number of its troops and its military equipment in Viet-Nam, has increased the financial appropriations for its military intervention, and has prepared to intensify its aggression against the Viet-Namese people.

Together with the other socialist countries, with all the peoples who love peace and freedom, the people and Government of the Romanian Socialist Republic condemn once more the United States aggression against the Viet-Namese people and strongly protest against the resumption of bombing on the territory of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam.

This further act of aggression is one more proof that the United States of America persists in flagrantly violating the elementary norms of international law, that it disregards the sacred right of the Viet-Namese people to be the sole masters in their own country, and that it is aggravating the already tense situation in South-East Asia, thus worsening the international atmosphere and endangering peace in the world. This policy of aggression, which has profound negative repercussions on international relations as a whole, places a heavy responsibility on the shoulders of the United States Government.

The Romanian Socialist Republic fully supports the position of the Government of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam, expressed in its four points, and the programme of the National Liberation Front -- the sole legitimate representative of the people of South Viet-Nam. Our country demands that the aerial bombardments and all acts of violation of the sovereignty and security of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam should cease; that all United States military forces and other interventionist troops be withdrawn from South Viet-Nam; that the Geneva Agreements of 1954 concerning Viet-Nam should be put into effect; and that the legitimate right of the Viet-Namese people themselves alone to decide their own destiny, in accordance with their will and interests, should be respected.

Our Committee cannot remain indifferent when a Great Power -- a member of this Committee -- commits acts of aggression which increase tension in the world and aggravate the danger threatening international peace and security, thus seriously prejudicing the work we are called upon to perform in order to fulfil the mandate assigned to us.

(Mr. Dumitrescu, Romania)

In the opinion of the Romanian delegation, any question relating to disarmament must be approached in such a way that its solution represents a contribution towards guaranteeing a lasting peace in the world, in which all peoples are equally interested.

Any agreement in the field of disarmament must necessarily be in full accord with the fundamental principles of international law. In our time, which is characterized by the appearance and consolidation of an ever-increasing number of independent States, world peace and security can be buttressed only by strict respect for the independence and sovereignty of States, by equality of rights, and by non-interference in their internal affairs. All peoples, large and small, are equally entitled to peace and security; they must therefore be able to enjoy these in equal fashion.

As other delegations have stressed, both in our Committee and during the recent debates of the General Assembly of the United Nations, it is necessary that in any agreement on disarmament there should be reflected a concern to safeguard the security of all States and of each State in particular, and the need to establish a balance of the reciprocal obligations of the parties.

The arms race and, above all, the nuclear danger which it entails affect in equal measure the security and right to life of all peoples. Is there any need to stress once again that the existence of gigantic stocks of weapons of mass destruction constantly increases the danger of a nuclear war? This fact must always be present in our thoughts and in our actions, especially at the moment when, aware of our responsibilities, we are taking up the tasks assigned to this Committee and examining the measures that ought to be taken.

With this fact in mind the Romanian delegation considers that, as part of the work of the Eighteen-Nation Committee, the greatest attention should be given to the major and urgent measures of disarmament, such as the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons and of all other weapons of mass destruction, and the liquidation of all existing stocks of such weapons. A first step along this path would be the assumption by the nuclear Powers of an obligation not to be the first to use such weapons.

(Mr. Dumitrescu, Romania)

In the opinion of the Romanian delegation, the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons is a measure of the highest importance, having many consequences for disarmament problems as a whole and favourable repercussions on the outcome of the efforts aimed at eliminating the danger of war. Consequently we consider that this problem -- which is on our agenda -- should be given all the attention it deserves and an appropriate place among our activities aimed at a thorough multilateral examination.

Romania, like a number of other countries, has expressed itself consistently in this sense, both at the United Nations and in this Committee. Thus the Romanian delegation stated as early as 1957, during the twelfth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations:

"The humanitarian principles on which the Charter is based demand that the United Nations should exert every effort to advance progressively to the outlawing of atomic and thermonuclear weapons, their elimination from the arsenals of States, and general disarmament."

(A/PV.689, para. 94)

Romania voted in favour of resolutions 1653 (XVI) and 1909 (XVIII) (ENDC/116) of the General Assembly of the United Nations regarding the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons and the convening of an international conference to sign a convention to this effect.

We are firmly convinced that the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons and of other weapons of mass destruction and, as a first step in this direction, an undertaking by the nuclear Powers not to be the first to use them, would have beneficial effects on the international situation as a whole. This could be a starting point for the halting of the nuclear arms race and the liquidation of stockpiles. As is known, the achievement of an agreement in this regard depends at present solely on the attitude of the Western nuclear Powers.

Post-war experience shows that one of the sources of international tension and of distrust among States is the existence of foreign military bases and the presence of armed forces on the territories of other States. Military bases and the presence of troops on the territories of other States are a threat to international peace and security and has a negative effect on relations between States. The strengthening



(Mr. Dumitrescu, Romania)

of peace and the elimination of any form of interference in the affairs of other peoples require the liquidation of foreign military bases and the withdrawal of troops stationed on the territories of other States, measures which appear in the agenda of this Committee.

In this respect I should like to draw your attention to the significance of resolution 2105 (XX) adopted by the United Nations General Assembly during its last session, which "Requests the colonial Powers to dismantle the military bases installed in colonial Territories and to refrain from establishing new ones".

We are convinced that progress towards a healthier international situation requires, not the maintenance, but on the contrary the liquidation of military blocs. Experience proves that the division of the world into military blocs increases international tension and fosters distrust among States, since the existence of the aggressive pacts of NATO, SEATO and CENTO carries in itself and encourages tendencies of domination over other peoples.

The proposals submitted by various governments regarding the creation of denuclearized zones in various parts of the world are well known. There is no doubt that the creation of such zones in various parts of the globe, through strict respect for the interests of the States concerned and for the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter, would make an important contribution to the cause of peace and disarmament.

As regards the problem of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, which is also included in the agenda of this session of our Conference, we consider that in order truly to serve the cause of general security and to deserve the confidence of the peoples, it is essential that this problem should be an integral part of a complex of effective measures designed to lead to the elimination of the nuclear danger, to the achievement of general disarmament. I refer to the measures about which I have just spoken, such as the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons and of all other weapons of mass destruction and, as a first step along this path, an undertaking by nuclear Powers not to be the first to use them; I refer also to the liquidation of existing stockpiles, the elimination of military bases and the withdrawal of troops stationed on the territories of other States.

As many delegations have stressed, both at the twentieth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations and within this Conference, an agreement on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons which provided, in a unilateral manner, for obligations imposed on the non-nuclear Powers alone would not meet the legitimate

(Mr. Dumitrescu, Romania)

demand of each people to see its right to equal security assured. The agreement should contain adequate obligations imposed on the nuclear Powers as well, so as to offer guarantees for the security of all States, and should also be drafted in such a way as to obtain accessions on as wide a scale as possible.

The non-proliferation of nuclear weapons cannot be conceived as an end in itself, for it is only one of the component measures of the programme of nuclear disarmament, in the urgent accomplishment of which a special responsibility devolves on the nuclear Powers and towards which all our joint efforts must be directed. As we have already had occasion to emphasize, we are opposed to plans for the creation of multilateral or Atlantic nuclear forces within NATO, and against any plan whatever of this type, for we believe that such plans could only have negative effects both on the relations between States in general and on the progress of our negotiations. At the same time, we should like to express our support for the proposals put forward by the Government of the German Democratic Republic and recently submitted to this Committee, concerning the elimination of nuclear weapons from German territory (ENDC/168). The implementation of these proposals would, without any doubt, be a major contribution to the cause of European security.

We reaffirm on this occasion the support which Romania has given and continues to give to the idea of convening a world disarmament conference with the participation of all States.

We consider opportune the procedure which has been adopted: (ENDC/PV.235, p.11) that during this session the examination of questions relating to general disarmament -- which is the essential task of our Committee -- will take place concomitantly with the discussion of collateral measures.

The Romanian delegation, being determined to contribute, as far as it is able, together with the other participants, to the success of our work, will carefully study the proposals already put forward and those which will be submitted to our Committee, and will support any initiative designed to promote the cause of disarmament and peace.

Mr. CAVALLETTI (Italy) (translation from French): As it appears that no other delegation wishes to speak at the moment, I should like to take advantage of the time at our disposal to make a few comments on the progress of our work up to now, and to try to point to some new and interesting elements which have emerged.

Our last meeting was unfortunately taken up with some very polemical interventions by the delegations of Bulgaria and the Soviet Union. This morning we have heard another statement, by the Romanian delegation, which at least at its beginning was of the same nature. These three delegations have thought fit once again to level unjust accusations against our allies by radically distorting the historical truth. This is most regrettable, and my delegation is bound to note once again the negative character of such interventions. Fortunately our recent meetings have also been marked by certain positive and constructive elements, and it is in connexion with these that my delegation would like to address a few words to the Committee.

First, there was Mr. Kosygin's message to the Conference (ENDC/167). My delegation, which has not yet had an opportunity of commenting on this message, is happy that the Soviet Government has also wished, through a special message addressed to our Committee, to confirm its interest in the resumption of our negotiations on disarmament and to assure us that the Soviet delegation will take an active part in the search for agreements. In this message we believe we have discerned -- alongside the repetition of a number of old proposals which the Soviet delegation knows perfectly well are not acceptable -- an encouraging element: the solemn reaffirmation by the most qualified Soviet authority of the Soviet Union's intention to engage in sincere and earnest negotiations and to conclude a non-proliferation agreement as soon as possible. I think that when the time comes the Committee should explore in greater detail Premier Kosygin's message concerning non-proliferation, by requesting clarifications and by comparing it with the corresponding passages in the message from President Johnson (ENDC/165).

Both messages have one point in common, to which I should like at once to refer. Both messages show an interest in the situation of the non-nuclear and non-aligned countries by seeking to offer them, within the framework of a non-proliferation agreement, counterparts for their renunciation of nuclear weapons. The message of the President of the United States, while advocating an appropriate

(Mr. Cavalletti, Italy)

strengthening of the peace-keeping action of the United Nations, at once offers his support to non-nuclear countries which, having renounced nuclear weapons, might become victims of a nuclear attack. Thus the attitude that the Government of the United States envisages in this case is positive and active.

I do not think that this is the kind of "protective guarantee pact" which some non-aligned countries, rightly jealous of their own political situation as non-committed States, do not wish to see established, in order thus to be able to maintain their complete independence. It seems to me that, on the contrary, what President Johnson's message contains is an autonomous and unilateral promise of support and assistance of which an attacked country could, in accordance with its needs and desires, either avail itself or not.

Premier Kosygin's message approaches this problem from a different angle: the Soviet Union undertakes not to attack a non-nuclear country on two conditions: that the country accepts the non-proliferation agreement, and that it has no nuclear weapons in its territory. There I think I see a positive element: that there is no insistence, as a condition precedent, on the establishment of certain denuclearized zones in Europe which, as everyone knows quite well, are contrary to the most elementary criteria of balance.

But the conduct proposed by the Soviet Union is negative in the legal sense. It is a non facere: that is, abstention from attacking. It would perhaps be still more constructive if the Soviet Union were also to promise, again autonomously and avoiding the idea of imposing a guarantee which is neither sought nor desired, its contingent support for a non-nuclear country attacked with nuclear weapons.

At all events, the Soviet proposals require some clarification, because the text of the message does not say clearly how it would be decided objectively whether a country party to a non-proliferation agreement had nuclear weapons in its territory or not. This is, I think, a rather important point which perhaps requires some explanations.

Turning now to the statements which have been made today and during our recent meetings, I reserve the right to study the statement of the representative of Romania, who, as I have observed, dwelt upon many old proposals which, as everyone knows well, are incompatible with the fundamental principles of disarmament and consequently do not offer any concrete or useful prospects for our work.

(Mr. Cavalletti, Italy)

As for the statement made by the representative of Poland at the 237th meeting, I have studied it with the closest attention and I hope that he will allow me to ask him some questions and give him some replies. If I understood correctly the reasoning of the representative of Poland, he sees (ENDC/PV.237, pp. 26 et seq.) a contradiction between the Western desire to conclude a non-proliferation agreement and the maintenance and development of some nuclear collaboration within the Atlantic framework.

In this connexion I should like to point out to him that a non-proliferation agreement falls within the sphere of collateral measures designed to facilitate and advance the process of disarmament. But the non-proliferation agreement is not in itself a disarmament measure. Under such an agreement there is no scaling-down of the military balance between the two alliances. The non-proliferation agreement does not even constitute a "freeze" measure, except in the sense that a "freeze" is definitively adopted and becomes legally binding in regard to the number of countries having access to nuclear weapons. The military arrangements and collaborations of the alliances, whether conventional or nuclear, would be neither weakened nor interrupted by a non-proliferation agreement. This is obviously unfortunate, because we desire a rapid and progressive process of the balanced disarmament of the two alliances. But we have to bear in mind that it is through other agreements and by other means than a non-proliferation agreement that this task has to be tackled.

On the other hand, Mr. Blusztajn seems to regard as weak the texts that have been proposed by the Western Powers for the non-proliferation agreement. He seems to have found loopholes in the wording of the United States draft treaty (ENDC/152), which in his opinion is incompatible with the language of the United Nations resolution on non-proliferation (A/RES/2028(XX); ENDC/161). I think that he considers the words "directly or indirectly" inadequate, and that he finds the words "national control", above all, open to criticism.

If I am not reproducing Mr. Blusztajn's thought accurately, I apologize, and I am always willing to correct my interpretation. But if I have correctly interpreted his meaning, I would urge him to think about another United Nations document, a resolution for which his delegation voted and for which, indeed, we all voted. I am referring to resolution 2033(XX) regarding the denuclearization of Africa. I do not think that anyone in the United Nations thought that the text of the resolution on this subject, which was submitted to us by a group of African countries, was presented in bad faith and with the ulterior motive of preserving

(Mr. Cavalletti, Italy)

loop-holes in the denuclearization of Africa. We all voted for that resolution knowing that it was sincere, fully satisfactory and in accordance with its object. If my recollection is correct, I did not hear a single statement to the contrary during the debate in the United Nations.

The text of operative paragraph 6 of this resolution reads as follows:

(spoke in English)

"Urges those States possessing nuclear weapons and capability not to transfer nuclear weapons, scientific data or technological assistance to the national control of any State, either directly or indirectly, in any form which may be used to assist such States in the manufacture or use of nuclear weapons in Africa;" (A/RES/2033(XX); ENDC/162)

(continued in French)

If this text cannot be criticized (and in our opinion it certainly cannot), then why would the text of the Western proposals on non-proliferation, which uses the same words as resolution 2033(XX) and resembles it like two drops of water, be inadequate and conceal dangerous loop-holes?

Let us try to make a mutual effort at comprehension and good faith within this Committee. Let us try to convince ourselves that words have the same value and the same meaning whether they are put forward and used by one side or the other. For that is the way — I should say the only way — in which we could diminish distrust and begin to agree. And that is what my delegation most sincerely desires.

Mr. FOSTER (United States of America): Following the constructive comments of the representative of Italy which we have just heard — and I am grateful for his comments on the false statements made by the speaker who preceded him —, I regret that it is necessary for me once more to rebut the distorted attacks on my country's policies with respect to South-East Asia.

I have made our position clear many times, most recently at our 235th and 236th meetings. We are in Viet-Nam to help in collective defence against aggression. We are fighting there to protect the right of a small country to determine its own affairs without interference from its neighbours. All we seek is an end to aggression and the achievement of a just and a lasting peace.

We shall, of course, study those parts of the statement of the Romanian representative which appear to have been directed toward the constructive aspects of our task here.

The CHAIRMAN (Brazil): As no other representative wishes to speak this morning in the general debate, it will continue at the next meetings of the Committee. However, in order to speed up the work of this Committee I ask whether there is any delegation at today's meeting that is prepared to speak specifically on the next item on our programme, the question of non-proliferation. In so doing I am bearing in mind the rule and practice of this Committee that no delegation is precluded from raising and discussing any subject or proposal in any plenary meeting of the Committee.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian): The Soviet delegation considers that you, Mr. Chairman, have raised in a very timely manner the question of the desirability of passing to the next question. It seems to us that we have now reached a stage of our work when we should pass from general statements to a concrete discussion of the questions before us. For that reason the Soviet delegation would suggest that, starting next week -- or even at today's meeting if, as you, Mr. Chairman, have suggested, anyone is prepared to speak --, the Committee should pass to a discussion of the question of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, to the examination of a draft treaty.

We also agree with you, Mr. Chairman, that those who wished to do so could also make general statements at the same time. This would mean that the general debate would continue for those who wish to take part in it, and that the discussion of specific questions would not be delayed. As I have already stated, the Soviet delegation will be prepared to speak on the question of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons as early as the next meeting of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN (Brazil): Perhaps the members of the Committee might find it useful for us to have a brief exchange of views on the order of our work and the various procedural suggestions which have been made for speeding it up. After the adoption of our programme of work (ENDC/PV.235, p.11), several procedural suggestions were put forward. It might be helpful if we could ventilate some of our thoughts regarding the procedural aspects of our work. I am not suggesting that we take any decisions, but only that we have an exchange of views and opinions so that we shall all understand the various points of view on these matters a little more fully.

I also suggest, if there is no objection, that our discussion might be an informal one without any verbatim record. Is there any objection to having such a discussion?

Mr. TRIVEDI (India): Mr. Chairman, before we go into the matter you have just mentioned I should like to say a few words in regard to the previous suggestion which you made and on which the Soviet representative made some comments.

As we all know, it was decided by the Committee that there should first be a general debate. There was then to be a general debate on the question of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. After that, one meeting was to be devoted to general and complete disarmament, and one to collateral measures. I think that before we revise our decision we must give more thought to the matter, because the suggestion which has just been put forward seems to revise our earlier decision. I do not wish to refer in this plenary meeting to informal discussions, but it is known that the non-aligned delegations have discussed this matter. Furthermore, some of the non-aligned delegations have not yet spoken in the general debate. For example, I am going to speak next Tuesday; a representative of one of the other non-aligned delegations is going to speak next Thursday; and another on the following Tuesday.

I think it would be inappropriate for the conduct of our business to have a general statement and a specific statement mixed up together. Let us first complete the general debate, as was unanimously decided by this Committee. The Indian delegation does not see any specific need, any urgency or any special contingent circumstances which require a change in our earlier decision. There are still many members of the Committee who wish to speak, and it would be gracious and natural for us to show courtesy particularly to new members. The representative of Burma has yet to speak, and the representative of Ethiopia will no doubt wish to speak at a later date.

I think there would be no calamity if the general debate were prolonged by ten days or so. It would be most inappropriate to interrupt the general debate intermittently for specific discussions. For the sake of our staff, and to give ourselves an opportunity to study papers and give thought to the very weighty statements being pronounced by members of this Committee, it is necessary that we should first finish the general debate.



The CHAIRMAN (Brazil): I should like to reiterate that, when I proposed to the Committee that we should proceed to discuss specific items, it was not my intention that the general debate should stop. I clearly stated that the general debate would continue. My proposal had as its sole purpose the greatest possible acceleration of our work.

I now ask the representative of India whether he has any objection to the procedure I have proposed for an off-the-record exchange of views. I see that he has no objection, and we shall therefore proceed to such an exchange of views.

An informal discussion took place at this point.

The Conference decided to issue the following communiqué:

"The Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament today held its 239th plenary meeting in the Palais des Nations, Geneva, under the chairmanship of H.E. Ambassador Antonio Correa do Lago, representative of Brazil.

"Statements were made by the representatives of Romania, Italy, the United States, the Soviet Union and India.

"The next meeting of the Conference will be held on Tuesday, 15 February 1966, at 10.30 a.m."

The meeting rose at 12.05 p.m.

